

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/927,764

Applicant(s)

MILJKOVIC, DUSAN

Examiner

Josephine Young

Art Unit

1623

All Participants:(1) Josephine Young.(2) Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D..**Status of Application: pending**

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 May 2003**Time:** 11:30 am (EST)**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,080,425 to MILJKOVIC.

Claims discussed:

Claims 1-20.

Prior art documents discussed:

*U.S. Patent No. 6,080,425 to MILJKOVIC.***Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that while claims 13-20 are allowable, claims 1-12 are not and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,080,425 to MILJKOVIC would be maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action dated November 20, 2002. To advance the present application to allowance, Applicant's Representative agreed to an Examiner's Amendment cancelling claims 1-12. Further, the Examiner indicated that the dependency of claim 18 inappropriately references claim 13, rather than claim 17. Applicant's Representative agreed to an Examiner's Amendment to correct the dependency.